BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: NHDOT Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCE: January 21, 2015
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Christine Perron
Ron Crickard
Marc Laurin
Matt Urban
Rebecca Martin
John Sargent
Bill Saffian
Mark Hemmerlein
David Scott
Dustan Eurieck
Tim Mallette
Jim Kirouac
Steve Liakos
Ron Grandmaison
Bob Davis
Kevin Nyhan
Jill Edelmann
Carol Niewola
Rita Hunt
Nancy Mayville
Lou Barker

Army Corps of Engineers
Michael Hicks

EPA
Mark Kern

NHDES
Gino Infascelli
Lori Sommer

NH Fish & Game
Carol Henderson

NH Natural Heritage Bureau
Melissa Coppola

CMA Engineers
Owen Krauss
Britt Audet

The Smart Associates
Jennifer Riordan

Town of Hooksett
Leo Lessard
Kathie Northup
JoAnn Duffy

HDR Engineering
John Weston
Ronald O'Blenis

Normandeau Associates
Mark Hutchins

(When viewing these minutes online, click on an attendee to send an e-mail)

PRESENTATIONS/ PROJECTS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:
(minutes on subsequent pages)

Finalization of November Meeting Minutes 2
Alstead, X-A002(091), 20817 2
North Hampton, non-federal, 16060 2
Keene-Swanzey, A000(458), 10309P 4
Laconia, X-A001(150), 16144 5
Section 106 Programmatic Agreement 6
Hooksett, non-federal, 29655 6
Plaistow Commuter Rail Extension Study, NH-95-X016, 68082 9

(When viewing these minutes online, click on a project to zoom to the minutes for that project)

NOTES ON CONFERENCE:

Finalization of November Meeting Minutes

The November 19, 2014 meeting minutes were finalized.

Alstead, X-A002(091), 20817

Bill Saffian provided an overview of the project, which will address the bridge that carries NH Route 123A over Warren Brook. The bridge is located just north of the intersection of NH Route 123A with NH Routes 123/12A. The bridge was damaged during the flood event that occurred in 2005. Flood damage was repaired; however the bridge is still in poor condition. In addition, the hydraulic opening of the bridge is not sufficient. For these reasons, bridge replacement is proposed.

The bridge is a concrete T-Beam structure that was built in 1935. The width of the bridge is 29'. The span from abutment to abutment along the center line of the roadway is 30'. The span perpendicular to the opening is 24', creating a waterway opening of 170 square feet. The crossing recommended by the NH Stream Crossing Guidelines, based on the estimated bankfull width, is 54'. The proposed bridge would have a span of 68' perpendicular to the channel, with a waterway opening of 250 square feet. The next bridge upstream has a 52' span and 138 square foot opening. A hydraulic study has not yet been completed; however it is anticipated that the proposed design will not present any hydraulic concerns.

The stream banks upstream and downstream from the current bridge are steep; these will be continued through the proposed structure. Due to the steep slopes, no wildlife shelf is proposed. An existing concrete slab in the channel will be removed to create a natural stream bottom. A fluvial geomorphic assessment, completed in 2006 for the Alstead area, recommended spanning the bankfull width at this crossing or providing overflow structures. Overflow structures do not work at this location. However, the proposed bridge does span the bankfull width.

Mike Hicks asked if there would be impacts in the river channel. B. Saffian replied that some impacts would be necessary during construction, including the removal of the concrete slab in the channel. Christine Perron noted that it is early in the design process and that the project would be reviewed again at a future meeting once proposed impacts were better defined.

Gino Infascelli asked if one way traffic would be maintained during construction. B. Saffian said that was the desire, but there is a concern with the intersection being in close proximity to the bridge, so a temporary turn lane may be needed. This is currently under study. Traffic volumes are low in this area, which will help facilitate traffic control during construction.

Carol Henderson asked for more information on the project schedule. B. Saffian noted that the project is currently on-shelf to advertise in September 2016 if funds are available at that time.

C. Henderson noted that NH Fish & Game has a stream restoration project approximately 900' upstream from the bridge, and she recommended coordinating with John Magee.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

North Hampton, non-federal, 16060

Bob Davis provided a summary of alternatives that have been considered to address a failing 72" corrugated metal pipe that carries the Winnicut River under Walnut Avenue. The pipe has a drainage area of 3,100 acres and is located on very mucky soils. It is estimated that any replacement structure will require up to 20' of muck excavation to provide solid footings. There is also a history of beaver activity in this area.

Four alternatives have been considered and preliminary cost estimates were developed as follows:
8'x7' Box Culvert ($370,000)
6' concrete pipe ($280,000)
12'x7' Box Culvert ($440,000)
34' Span Bridge ($715,000)

At this time, the Department's preferred alternative is the 8'x7' box culvert, which would improve sediment transport and hydraulics, lower the headwater for the 100-year storm, and provide a larger opening with a natural bottom. Additional information is needed before this alternative can be refined, including geotechnical recommendations, the need for easements, and potential utility conflicts. However, based on information known to date, the 8'x7' box culvert does meet the general design criteria of the NHDES Stream Crossing Rules, and does provide a cost-effective improvement to the existing condition. Tim Mallette offered an opinion that providing a structure any larger than the 8'x7' box culvert could create the potential for downstream flooding at Lovering Road. The 8'x7' box culvert is the largest structure that can be installed without lowering the 100-year modelled headwater to an elevation that may trigger the need for FEMA remodeling and submittal of a Letter of Map Revision. AECOM provided the updated topography used for the DFIRM & FIS scheduled to become effective in 2015. T. Mallette also noted that the stream reach containing the culvert is a natural constriction between two large wetland areas. The larger hydraulic system includes culverts of limited size upstream and downstream. The volume of runoff from any significant storm takes many days to flow through the system.
Preliminary impacts resulting from the 8'x7' box culvert have been estimated and would consist of approximately 310 square feet of permanent impact; 815 square feet of temporary impact; and 160 linear feet of channel impact.

Carol Henderson noted that the Winnicut River is an important fisheries habitat. She asked if a larger structure, such as the 12'x7' box culvert, would be more of a deterrent to damming by beavers. B. Davis replied that a beaver deceiver structure would be proposed, such as a specially design chain link fence structure, for the culvert inlet in order to prevent damming. This type of structure would not obstruct passage of aquatic organisms. C. Henderson asked that trapping be considered as well, and it was noted that the Department does have licensed trappers that can go to sites like this on occasion as needed.

Gino Infascelli asked for more information on the structures located downstream. B. Davis answered that there are two 12-inch pipes and one 6-foot pipe located downstream.

G. Infascelli noted that the culvert is located in an area identified by the Wildlife Action Plan as having the highest ranked wildlife habitat by ecological condition, and any improvements in connectivity should be pursued.

G. Infascelli asked if installing the new culvert directly adjacent to the existing culvert would facilitate construction dewatering. B. Davis responded that doing so would require realigning the natural stream channel. Christine Perron commented that there would be a meeting soon to discuss construction methods, and this could be brought up for consideration.

C. Henderson asked for information on the project schedule. B. Davis replied that an advertising date has not yet been scheduled. It is anticipated that the project will advertise this calendar year after obtaining the wetlands permit.

C. Perron asked Lori Sommer about the need for mitigation. L. Sommer replied that mitigation would not be required since impacts would be in the same footprint as the existing structure.

This project was previously reviewed on the following dates: 10/15/2014.

Keene-Swanzey, A000(458), 10309P

Regarding the construction of the Multi-Use Trail (MUT) bridge over NH 101, Ron Grandmaison stated that the project has been on the 2021 advertising schedule; however, due to the availability of TE funds that would otherwise lapse, there is now an opportunity for DOT to move up the advertising date to September 2015. The DOT is proposing that a stand-alone permit be done for the bridge construction. Due to the quick turnaround that would now be needed for the project, the outstanding mitigation for the Keene-Swanzey interim improvements cannot be resolved and advertised with the MUT bridge as has been discussed in the past.

Marc Laurin briefly described the permitting and mitigation history of the Keene-Swanzey, 10309 project and the interim construction contracts. A handout was provided to summarize the floodplain and wetland impacts resulting from the interim projects that have been constructed, as well as an estimate of the remaining impacts that are proposed. The original permit has expired and the total impacts incurred under the old permits consisted of 17.2 ac-ft. of floodplain and 3.2 acres of wetlands. The estimated remaining floodplain impacts are 9.5 ac-ft. and 2.8 acres of wetland impacts. The totals that will need to be mitigated will therefore be 26.7 ac-ft. and 6.0 acres. Presently DOT has preserved about 80 acres of land south of the "T" Intersection as part of the previously agreed upon mitigation package.

R. Grandmaison suggested that DOT apply for a new permit for the MUT bridge impacts only (estimated at 5.7 ac-ft. of floodplains and at 0.7 acres of wetlands) and provide an in-lieu fee payment to the ARM fund on the actual impacts. This permit could be conditioned to allow time to find a suitable site for the outstanding mitigation that would constructed/purchased with the remaining interim projects, the 10309L (Ashuelot River bridge and widening) and the 10309J ("T" Intersection improvements) contracts, which would be permitted separately. The mitigation is anticipated to be completed by 2021, based on the latest Ten Year Plan.

Mark Kern would favor the approach of providing an in-lieu fee for the MUT impacts as mitigation. Michael Hicks thought that it would be appropriate, but will need to coordinate with the Corps' Planning Office regarding the outstanding flood storage compensation and how it would fit with the Floodplain Executive Order. Lori Sommer agreed in principal, but will need to see how this new permit could be best written up to take into account the original permit, and how to best document and address the outstanding mitigation. She wondered if a Public Hearing would occur if new areas were considered as mitigation. R. Grandmaison answered that the hearing held for the overall Keene-Swanzey project still applied for the MUT bridge construction and a Public Informational meeting will be scheduled to receive public input. If new mitigation is proposed in areas not covered by the original hearing then the appropriate hearing process would need to be followed. L. Sommer suggested coordination with the City on what would be appropriate mitigation for all the impacts.

Further coordination with the Resource Agencies will occur to discuss how best to document the remaining mitigation requirements in the new permit for the MUT bridge. M. Laurin will provide M. Hicks with the

original Corp permit number and M. Hicks will further investigate if a Corps Section 408 review would be required.

This project was previously reviewed on the following dates: 6/24/1994, 3/23/1995, 2/22/1996, 11/14/1996, 4/16/1997, 7/16/1997, 9/24/1997, 10/18/2000, 5/16/2001 & 10/15/2003, 6/21/2006, 10/29/2009, 12/10/2009, 8/21/2013.

Laconia, X-A001(150), 16144

Owen Krauss (CMA Engineers) provided an overview of the project, which involves the rehabilitation of the US Route 3 bridge over the NH Railroad in Laconia. The existing bridge superstructure was built in 1933 and the bridge substructure was also rehabilitated at that time. The project will involve bridge closure, removal of the existing superstructure, rehabilitation of the existing abutments and adjacent retaining wall, and placement of concrete slabs. There will be limited approach work.

The existing bridge has a 32-foot maximum span and a 17.5-foot clearance over the railroad. The project proposes to raise the clearance to 18.5 feet. The standard railroad clearance is 22 feet; however, that is not feasible for this project since it would involve extensive approach work and changes to nearby intersections.

Endicott Rock State Park is located northeast of the bridge and may be used as a laydown area during construction. Channel Lane, located southeast of the bridge, will be kept open during construction. This road provides access to Thurston's Marina and it may also be used as a detour for emergency vehicles during bridge closure. Regular traffic will be diverted onto state roads, which is a 15-mile detour.

The Winnipesaukee Scenic Railroad (Hobo Railroad) operates from May until late October. Late fall/winter construction is proposed to avoid impacts to the railroad and to traffic in the area during the summer/fall season.

Jenn Riordan (The Smart Associates) provided an overview of the natural resources present. No Natural Heritage Bureau records were found in the project area and no floodplains are present. The construction laydown area may be partially located in the 250-foot Protected Shoreland for the Weir Channel, but the bridge is beyond the Shoreland zone. No water quality treatment measures are expected to be necessary since there will only be minor increase in impervious surface.

The only wetland resource within the project area is a drainage swale that is located between the railroad and Lakeside Avenue. The swale extends north from the bridge and drains to a pipe that connects to the storm drain system. The swale is not directly connected to other wetlands and may be considered non-jurisdictional (not regulated).

Michael Hicks asked if there are any historic properties nearby. J. Riordan replied that an inventory is being completed, but she hasn't seen the findings yet. The bridge, the railroad, and Endicott Rock State Park are being evaluated since they may all have historic value. Mark Hemmerlein mentioned that Endicott Rock State Park is archaeologically sensitive. J. Riordan stated that Independent Archaeological Consulting is doing a Phase IA study. No excavation or other subsurface work would occur within the park if it is used as a laydown area during construction. It was mentioned that Endicott Rock State Park may be a Section 6(f) and Section 4(f) resource.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Section 106 Programmatic Agreement

A Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) was recently executed by NHDOT, FHWA, and the NH State Historic Preservation Office. Kevin Nyhan provided an overview of the PA.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act is a federal regulation that provides some protections to historical properties during projects that use federal funding, licensing or permitting. Transportation projects that receive federal funding from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) all undergo Section 106 review. In December of 2012, the NHDOT started working with FHWA and the NH State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to develop a PA to streamline Section 106 review of federally-funded transportation projects in New Hampshire.

The PA establishes procedures for processing projects, provides standardized forms for reporting, and clearly lays out the roles and responsibilities of FHWA, NHDOT, SHPO and the project sponsor in order to operate under the PA. It streamlines the Section 106 process by promoting consistency and transparency of project development and review practices and requirements, and by encouraging an understanding among project sponsors of the goals of Section 106 and the benefits of incorporating those goals early during a project's design. A wide range of transportation projects typically do not impact or affect historical resources. The PA streamlines the Section 106 review of these types of projects by enabling NHDOT to conduct individual historical resource reviews, thereby removing FHWA and the SHPO from project-by-project evaluation activities, and eliminating the need to submit a Request for Project Review (RPR) to SHPO.

The PA applies to a subset of federally-funded transportation undertakings that are identified in the agreement as either Appendix A undertakings (undertakings with no potential to cause effects to historical resources) or Appendix B undertakings (undertakings with minimal potential to cause effects to historical resources). Appendix A undertakings include projects such as pavement rehabilitation, signal timing, signing and some bridge maintenance activities. The NHDOT Cultural Resources Program (consisting of staff members who meet the professional qualifications outlined in 36 CFR 61) will make the determination whether a proposed project is an Appendix A undertaking. If so, Section 106 review will be limited to completion of an Appendix A Certification Form. Appendix B undertakings require further coordination with the NHDOT Cultural Resources Program, as well as information gathering due to the potential, albeit minimal, for the undertaking to cause effects to historic resources. These undertakings include such projects as non-historic bridge and culvert maintenance, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and railroad improvements, among others. With a completed Appendix B Certification Form and accompanying materials, a project sponsor will coordinate directly with the NHDOT Cultural Resources Program, which will again determine the appropriate next steps, such as the survey of potential historical properties.

For projects that qualify as Appendix A or Appendix B undertakings, the Certification Form will take the place of the Section 106 Effect Memo, and submittal of a Request for Project Review (RPR) to SHPO is not necessary in most cases. For projects that do not qualify for review under the PA, including projects with no federal funding, coordination with SHPO will still be required. NHDOT may coordinate with SHPO at some time in the future to develop a Memorandum of Agreement that addresses review of state-funded projects.

Hooksett, non-federal, 29655

Britt Audet (CMA Engineers) provided an overview of the project. The project addresses the Lilac Bridge over the Merrimack River in the Town of Hooksett. Built in 1909, the Lilac Bridge is the only remaining

three-span High Pratt truss in the State. In 1936, the southerly span was washed away during a flood event and was replaced. The bridge is on the State Register of Historic Places. In 1969, the bridge was posted at 6 tons. In 1970, the timber deck was replaced and gusset plates repaired. The bridge has been closed to traffic since 1976 and has been maintained by the Town since that time. Today the bridge remains closed but serves as a utility crossing for an active sewer line.

Recent findings by the State had shown deficiencies along the bottom chord of the truss. Upon further investigation by CMA Engineers, it was determined that the bottom chord had completely fractured at several locations and had significant (80%) fractures at others. After the findings, in September 2014, CMA Engineers put out to bid an emergency stabilization plan that received one bid, which was considered unresponsive, and the project was not awarded. Currently the bridge remains gated off and closed to all traffic and the river is barricaded to preclude boat traffic under two spans.

A structural analysis determined that 12-23 inches of snow accumulation on the bridge could cause further failure and collapse. As a matter of public safety, the bridge should be secured or removed. Alternatives considered include the following: removal of the superstructure requiring a sewer line relocation, replacement of the superstructure with a modern bridge, securing the bridge and repairing critical areas (for a temporary 5-10 year solution), rehabilitation of the bridge, and do nothing.

CMA Engineers presented the project alternatives and opinions of cost to the Town at a Town Council Meeting on December 10th and 17th, 2014. On December 17th the Town Council unanimously decided to remove the bridge and replace it with a pedestrian bridge maintaining the existing abutments and piers. Funding for the project is coming from the Town of Hooksett, the NHDOT, and the Hooksett Sewer Commission.

It is anticipated that a wetlands permit will be required for temporary and permanent impacts within the Merrimack River for the removal of the existing bridge and construction of the new bridge. A Natural Heritage Bureau database check revealed that brook floater (State Endangered) and bald eagle (State Threatened) occurrences have been documented in the vicinity of the project. It is believed that the only impact to bald eagles would be from cutting down and removing any large trees, which is not anticipated with this project. A mussel survey of the river will be commissioned to determine if brook floaters are present within the anticipated area of temporary wetland impact for the removal of the bridge. The Army Corps and the Coast Guard have been notified about the project. An alternatives analysis with documentation of public input is nearly complete.

Mike Hicks asked if the sewer line will be maintained on the new bridge. B. Audet stated that the sewer utility crossing will be maintained; the existing piping will be replaced during construction of the new bridge.

M. Hicks asked what the feedback has been from the Coast Guard. B. Audet stated that the Coast Guard jurisdictional limits are to the north in Concord, and that it is still being determined if they will have any involvement in the project. M. Hicks stated that if the Coast Guard requires a permit, then the Coast Guard would be the lead federal agency for the project. Proposed in-water work and 404 impacts will determine if the Army Corps still needs to be involved with the project.

Matt Urban asked if the existing piers had to be refaced. Britt Audet stated that it is a possibility but has yet to be determined. There was discussion about whether or not refacing would require Army Corps involvement. M. Hicks replied that it may not, although he would need to hear from the Coast Guard before making a determination. Until Coast Guard involvement is determined, M. Hicks said that he would stay involved with the project with the assumption that the Army Corps will be the lead federal agency. He would contact the Coast Guard to help expedite the project.

M. Hicks asked if the sewer could be shut off if the bridge collapsed. B. Audet responded that a holding tank has been installed north of the bridge and can be used to retain wastewater in the event of the bridge collapsing. Steve Liakos commented that currently no one is allowed on the bridge, not even State inspectors, as it is too unsafe.

Carol Henderson commented that impacts in the river, once better defined, would need to be coordinated with Fish & Game in order to determine mussel survey needs. Also, she asked if the sewer line is going to be expanded. S. Liakos replied that, with the expanded Hooksett rest areas and the future opening of at least four restaurants in the area, the sewer will be seeing an increase in flow. However, it is not known if the town plans to expand the sewer line at this time.

C. Henderson asked when the bridge should come down in an ideal situation. Nancy Mayville stated that it should be removed as soon as possible due to its current condition.

B. Audet asked if a wetland impact areas associated with temporary construction access could be permitted with the understanding that actual impact locations could change after award of the demolition/construction contract. M. Urban stated that the DOT often shows temporary impacts along the length of the structure to account for uncertainty in construction access, although this does increase the permitting cost. C. Henderson stated that this wouldn't help with determining the exact areas needed to survey for the mussels and the best option would be to use barges with no channel impacts. S. Liakos stated that typically it is not desirable to restrict means and methods available to the contractor as it can drive up costs. There are three conceptual options for bridge removal: letting the bridge fall into the river (not an allowable option), using temporary support structures to the hold the bridge up as it is dismantled, and using cranes or barges to remove the bridge. The sewer line may be the factor that limits removal options for contractor.

S. Liakos asked for confirmation that the project would require no dredge or fill in the river. B. Audet confirmed that no dredge or fill is anticipated as part of the project.

Lori Sommer asked if there has ever been any mussel survey in this area. C. Henderson replied that a survey has not been done and that Fish & Game only knows is that brook floaters are in the vicinity of the project. Christine Perron asked if a permit could be issued prior to completion of a mussel survey, with a permit condition to require that the mussel survey be completed just prior to construction, along with further coordination with Fish & Game. This is an option that could be pursued if necessary to help expedite the project.

B. Audet asked if a Shoreland permit would be required. L. Sommer replied that, based on the information presented, a Shoreland permit would not be required since there appeared to be no need for impacts outside of wetlands jurisdiction.

Regarding the draft Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement for the adverse effect on historic resources, Jill Edelmann commented that there should be continued communication with the public and the Hooksett Historical Commission, and that the Division of Historic Resources may have interest in the aesthetics of the proposed new bridge.

N. Mayville asked if the removal of the existing bridge and construction of a new pedestrian bridge would be completed under one contract or if they could be separate contracts. Further, would that require two separate permitting efforts? M. Hicks was not sure without knowing final impacts. L. Sommer replied that the wetland permit could not be issued without knowing the permanent impacts, but that one permit could cover impacts for separate bridge removal and construction phases.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Plaistow Commuter Rail Extension Study, NH-95-X016, 68082

John Weston (HDR Engineering) presented an overview of the Plaistow Commuter Rail Extension Study. The goal of the study is to evaluate the extension of the MBTA Haverhill Line commuter rail service from Haverhill, MA to Plaistow, NH, including identifying the location of a new layover facility and station. The alternatives analysis was reviewed, which assessed all potential locations along the corridor and identified a recommended site. This site would include both the station and the layover facility and is located off of Joanne Drive in Plaistow. The public meeting is schedule in late January to review this recommendation with the public.

The remainder of the presentation included a summary of the projected impacts to natural resources (wetlands, streams, and floodplains) that may occur from the recommended alternative. Estimated impacts would entail just under one acre of wetland impacts, 1.97 acres of stream buffer, and 0.53 acres of floodplain. The conclusion of the study will be an Environmental Assessment, with the Federal Transit Administration as the lead federal agency.

Carol Henderson asked how it was determined that no sensitive wildlife habitat was determined. It was noted that a search of the NH Natural Heritage Bureau database was completed for threatened or endangered species. The only species noted was the banded sunfish, which is not a concern for this project.

Lori Sommer questioned what drove the decision away from Alternative III as it appears to have less impact to natural resources. J. Weston responded that the primary concerns were with traffic being generated from the station onto Main Street, where there are already concerns regarding traffic, and the proximity of the layover to the downtown area. Mike Hicks asked what the existing building on the Alternative III site was used for and if clean-up of the site would be a big issue. It was confirmed that much of the Alternative III site is owned by Testa, a construction/demolition company, and the building is primarily used for storage of equipment or material. In the past it was a manufacturing plant owned by Process Engineering. Ron O'Blenis (HDR Engineering) confirmed that there is concern about the risk for contamination on the site.

M. Hicks asked how many acres of fill would be required with the recommended alternative. It was confirmed that the Alternative II site would result in about an acre of fill in the wetlands although it is hoped that with additional design that number could be reduced.

L. Sommer inquired about the next steps for the project. R. O'Blenis discussed that earlier in the week there was a Project Advisory Meeting at which Alternative II was confirmed as the recommended alternative. A public meeting would be held later in the month. After that, an Environmental Assessment would be completed, with anticipated completion in June.

M. Hicks asked if the work would be coordinated with the Massachusetts Army Corps office. R. O'Blenis replied yes, but consensus on the preferred alternative in New Hampshire would first need to be reached. The impacts in Massachusetts are very limited, with all physical work occurring within the existing right-of-way and some impacts (primarily noise) requiring some mitigation.

C. Henderson inquired whether this would provide a linkage to Boston. It was explained that it would be an extension of service that already runs to Boston. It was noted that 100 people from the area already use

the train and that with the added service it is anticipated that additional people would find the train a better option. It is anticipated that about 250 people will board each day in Plaistow.

M. Hicks asked about the likelihood of funding. J. Weston explained that there are challenges to funding the project. It is assumed that New Hampshire state funds would not be available and Massachusetts would provide the local match to any federal funds. Federal funding programs to support such a project are limited and very competitive.

It was questioned if water quality treatment options were considered for the project. R. O'Blenis discussed that some options may be possible, such as pervious pavement, but that it is also standard design for layover facilities to have a system that includes oil/water separators to address any discharge from where the trains are parked.

It was strongly encouraged that the project be reviewed at a NHDOT Cultural Resource Coordination Meeting. Christine Perron noted that a Request for Project Review (which requires identification of the Area of Potential Effect) should be submitted to the NH Division of Historic Resources.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.